

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

218
6.5

HD WIDENER



HW K7WM 1

C 1218.16.5

**HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY**



**FROM THE
PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY
OF
WILLIAM JAMES**

**INSTRUCTOR AND PROFESSOR AT HARVARD
FROM 1872 TO 1910**

**THE GIFT OF HIS FAMILY
1923**

with the compliments of the author, who
ould be much pleased to receive the reader's
ion of its contents, expressed on the en-
ed card.

From your Bro. in Christ,

MILES GRANT,

5140.

Boston, Mass.

POSTAL CARD - ONE CENT.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

THIS SIDE IS FOR THE ADDRESS ONLY.



Miles Grant,

B 4 5140,

Boston

M



*Yours in Christ
Wile A. Brown*

FOREKNOWLEDGE

FOODS PRESCIENCE ETERNAL AND
UNIVERSAL

THE SAME PRINCIPLES WITH A CONTROL CONDITION AND POSITIVE FEEDBACK

THE MEAN BETWEEN ARMINIANISM AND CALVINISM

132

MILES GRANT

[illegible]

ROSEFON, A. 1988.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR

“ ”



FOREKNOWLEDGE

IS GOD'S PRESCIENCE ETERNAL AND
UNIVERSAL?

THE ETERNAL PRINCIPLES THAT CONTROL CONDITIONAL
AND POSITIVE PROPHECY

A GOLDEN MEAN BETWEEN ARMINIANISM AND
CALVINISM

BY

MILES GRANT

Author of "The Beauty of Holiness," "The Kingdom of God," "The Two Houses of Israel,"
"The Wages of Sin," "The Soul, What is It?" "The Spirit, What is It?" "What is
Man?" "The Rich Man and Lazarus," "The Nature of Man," "Spiritualism
Unveiled and Shown to be the Work of Demons," "Papal Dangers,"
"Papal Mysteries," "The Antichrist," "The Two Resurrections,
and the Intervening Millenium," "Prophetic Symbols,"
"The Mystery Explained," "Thoughts for
Thinkers," "Positive Theology,"
etc., etc.

BOSTON, MASS.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR

1896

Price 25 cts.

C 1218.16.5
✓

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
FROM THE
PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY
OF
WILLIAM JAMES
1898

PREFACE.

This book is the result of much prayer, careful searching of the Scriptures, and intense thinking. It is well known that for more than three hundred years, there has been a warm contention between the Arminians and the Calvinists; and that they are as far apart as when they began the controversy. The Arminians claimed, that God had *foreseen* "every event, every circumstance, every force and motion, every action and volition, every combination, every *result* of the entire universe, for both time and eternity, *at one glance*, —by a *perpetual changeless knowledge*."

The Calvinist said, if God has thus foreseen every thing; then it must be so; or his foresight was unreliable. But the Arminian assumed, that notwithstanding God had *foreseen* every thing; yet man was free to accept or refuse salvation. No, said the Calvinist. For if God has eternally foreseen that certain persons will be saved; and other certain ones be lost; it is not possible to change the original number that God foresaw, without showing that his foresight is not reliable; hence the Calvinist assumes that the number to be saved and the number to be lost, was eternally fixed before man was created.

The author of this work claims that there is a *golden mean* between Arminianism and Calvinism, where they can meet in heavenly union around the plain teaching of the Bible, supported by common sense and the eternal principles of pure reason. Should the reader see and accept the "Golden Mean," receiving the same benefit and comfort, as has come to the author; then there will be special cause for heavenly rejoicing.

MILES GRANT.

INTRODUCTION.

Inquiry is the gateway of information. Investigation is the key to the temple of knowledge. Study is the whetstone of reason. The independent thinker becomes the discoverer of new truth. He is the world's benefactor who converts an interrogation point into an exclamation point. Rome has taught for ages that "Ignorance is the mother of devotion," and the dark shadow of that falsehood has cast a baneful influence over Protestant theology. It has made "mystery" the scape-goat of all unreasonable theological dogmas. It has handicapped science, blindfolded reason, and outraged common sense. Ignorance is the mother of credulity, and the grandmother of superstition. Truth never has to don the robes of mystery to pass inspection at the bar of reason. Facts do not need to hide in the fort of superstition to be safe. Revelation and reason are not enemies. *The use of reason is not religious treason.* The truths of nature are as true as those of revelation. The truths of intuition do not contradict those of inspiration.

One of the unsettled questions of theology is that of divine foreknowledge. Calvinism, with its infallible decrees, and Arminianism, with its free will, and absolute foreknowledge, have been the polemical battle-ground of theological warriors and philosophical soldiers since the early period of the Reformation. Superstitious reverence has prevented many from entering the arena; but to-day we have a man, who, believing that it is the enlightened soul that worships God without the darkness of superstition, or the fear of priestcraft, has thrown down the gauntlet to the upholders of religious error, and challenged them to battle upon this field, using facts for his armor, reason for a shield, common sense for a helmet, and divine revelation for a sword.

In giving my indorsement to this book of Bro. Grant's, I wish to make a few statements defining my position on the question of divine prescience. I believe it is no more dishonoring to God to believe he is constantly thinking and planning, than to believe he is constantly working. If it degrades Deity to think a new thought, then it must degrade him to do a new act. There is past, present, and future with God; hence the idea of an "eternal

now" is absurd. God knows that Paul lived before I was born; he knows that I am now alive, and he knows that He will be alive to-morrow. *God cannot see falsely.* He cannot see a thing as fixed and certain, and yet free and contingent. That which is fixed is not free, and that which is free is not fixed. The common theory of foreknowledge annihilates the moral agency of God and man. God cannot save the man he knows he will damn, nor love those he knows he will hate, nor reveal himself to those whom he knows will always be ignorant of him. If God sees things before they exist, then there is fore and after with him. Is he ignorant of their non-existence? Must God see and know more than all things? If God sees things as they are, then he does not see them as they are not. If he sees them as fixed, he does not see them as free, and contingent. He could not see them before they exist the same as after they exist. If he saw them as contingent prior to their existence, he must see them as certain after their existence. If God sees as fixed what is not fixed, he sees something where there is nothing to be seen! This would make him see falsely.

Where there is freedom of will, there is no eternal fate. I believe in the freedom of will in the formation of character, and in its withdrawal by God at any time he sees fit to do so, before death as well as at that epoch. I believe that God's foreknowledge rests upon the eternal principles of all knowledge, *i. e.*, whatever is known as certain has no uncertainty about it; and whatever is known to be uncertain is not absolutely sure. Part with your sin, but keep your sense.

Yours for a common-sense theology,

H. W. BOWMAN.

CONTENTS.

The *figures* represent the *sections*.

CHAPTER I.

STATEMENTS OF DISTINGUISHED WRITERS. §1.

Among these are Bishop I. Wiley, 2, 26; Bishop Richard Watson, 3; Bishop E. O. Haven, 4; Archbishop John Tillotson, 5; Prof. Richard Rothe, 6; Dr. McCosh, 7; Dr. John Jamieson, 8, 19; Dr. Andrews, 10; Prof. B. P. Bowne, 12; Dr. L. D. McCabe, 16, 37; Prof. J. F. Hurst, 17; Dr. Wm. Fisk, 18; Pres. J. Edwards, 20, 34; Dr. Charles Hodge, 21, 35; Dr. John Dick, 22; Joel S. Hayes, 27; Bishop Wm. Taylor, 28; John Wesley, 29; Dr. Campbell, 31; Dugald Stewart, 32.

CHAPTER II.

CERTAINTIES. §45.

Two theories of foreknowledge and objections, 47. Sight and foresight not the *cause* of anything, 48. Dr. Hodge's statement, 49. Criticism on Dr. Hodge's statement, 50. Is the prescience of God eternal? 51. Is God's knowledge a personal acquirement? 51. James Jones' statement, 53. Foresight based on *purposing*, 54.

CHAPTER III.

ETERNAL NOW. §55.

Prof. Bowne's statements, 56, 61. Samuel Clark's statement, 57. Victor Cousin's statement, 58. Sir Wm. Hamilton's statement, 58. Dr. L. D. McCabe's statement, 59. Statement of Dr. N. Porter, 60. Did all of God's knowledge come at the same time? 62. Does God have any *new* thoughts? 63. Must God know *more* than all things to be omniscient? 64. Are all of God's purposes as old as his existence? 65. Dr. Dörner's statement, 66. Is time an objective reality? 67. Can God think? 68. Does God know something that he did not know from eternity? 69. Is God ignorant of contingencies? 70. Joseph Cook's statement, 71. Can the Lord make a new thing? 72.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GOLDEN MEAN. §73.

Tests of truth and error, 75-80. Is God *limited*? 81. Does knowledge precede the cause of the knowledge? 83. Bible examples, 84-90. Why did God create the angel who became a devil? 91. John Calvin's statement, 92.

CHAPTER V.

CONDITIONAL PROPHECY. §93.

Bible testimony in favor of conditional prophecy, 93-106.

CHAPTER VI.

POSITIVE PROPHECY. §107.

In positive prophecies there are no *conditions* nor *uncertainties*, 107.
Bible examples, 107-109. Four classes of prophecy, 110, 111.

CHAPTER VII.

QUERIES. §112, 113.

CHAPTER VIII.

PROPOSITIONS. §114-126.

CHAPTER I.

ETERNAL PRESCIENCE.

Is God's foresight eternal and universal?

§ 1. Perhaps no subject has been more perplexing to the human mind than the foreknowledge of God.

§ 2. Says Bishop I. Wiley:

"It is certain that it is difficult, perhaps, I should say impossible, for the intellect to conceive the possibility of even the Divine mind foreknowing events that are wholly dependent on what shall be the free choices of free beings."¹

§ 3. Bishop Richard Watson says:

"The manner in which the Divine Being foreknows the future choices of free agents is incomprehensible even to the greatest minds that have ever studied the subject."²

§ 4. Says Bishop E. O. Haven:

"I confess . . . I find it impossible to conceive that the actual knowledge of which of two or more possible choices a free agent will make, does really belong to omniscience."³

§ 5. Archbishop John Tillotson says:

"It would puzzle the greatest philosopher that ever was to give any tolerable account how any knowledge whatever can certainly foresee an event through uncertain and contingent causes."⁴

§ 6. Prof. Richard Rothe [Ro-ta], the distinguished German theologian, says that we are driven

"Imperceptibly to the view of non-prescience on the part of God of the free actions of imperfect beings. In any other view

¹ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, Introduction, p. 8.

² *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 393.

³ *Divine Nescience*, p. 291.

⁴ *Foreknowledge*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 214.

prayer becomes nonsense, and even a religiously inexplicable absurdity."¹

§ 7. Says Dr. McCosh:

"The human understanding cannot reconcile creature freedom with Divine prescience."²

It is believed that further examination of this subject will clearly show that the statement of Bishop E. O. Haven, just quoted, is the only true position, and is most fully sustained by the uniform teaching of the Bible.

§ 8. Says Dr. John Jamieson:

"No intelligent being, whether it be God, angel or man, can certainly foreknow a future act of his own will. God cannot foreknow what his own choice or determination will be until he has chosen or determined. Acts of the will must, in the nature of things, be prior to a knowledge of them. A knowledge of volitions, therefore, can never precede their existence. . . . Therefore, before God can foreknow future events, he must determine them."³

§ 9. This statement of Dr. Jamieson is so fortified by common sense, that it seems impossible to prove it untrue.

§ 10. Dr. Andrews, Pres. of Denison University (Baptist), at Granville, O., says:

"I have thought all the way from the top to the bottom of this subject; and I know that the absolute foreknowledge of future choices of free beings, acting under the law of liberty, is an absurdity."⁴

§ 11. Who can show that this statement does not agree with the harmonious teaching of the Bible?

§ 12. Says Prof. B. P. Bowne, Prof. of Philosophy in the Boston University, and a very noted metaphysician:

"A changeless knowledge of an ideal is possible; but a changeless knowledge of a changing thing is a contradiction. A knowledge of reality must embrace it as it is; and if reality changes, the knowledge must change to correspond. Unchangeability and nontemporality apply to God only in his relation to himself. They apply to his knowledge only as related to himself or to the ideal and the possible."⁵

¹ *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 221. ² *Ibid.*, p. 418.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 197, 198. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18. ⁵ *Philosophy of Theism*, p. 154.

§ 13. He further says:

"All allow that the contradictory is impossible; and hence we are not at liberty to include contradictions in our conceptions of the divine attributes. As omnipotence must be limited to the doable; so omniscience must be limited to the knowable."¹

§ 14. Again he says:

"The chief difficulty in omniscience concerns the foreknowledge of free choices. . . . The free creature can do nothing which was not foreseen as possible. . . . A free act, by its nature, is a new beginning; . . . hence a free act, until performed, is only a possibility, and not a fact. But knowledge must grasp the fact as it is, and hence it is held the act can be foreknown only as possible, and never as actual. Being only a possibility, antecedently to its occurrence, it must be known as such."²

§ 15. Prof. Bowne has put the subject in very clear and satisfactory light. The careful student of the Bible will find that his position is in complete accord with the Sacred Scriptures.

§ 16. Says Dr. L. D. McCabe, Prof. of Philosophy in Ohio Wesleyan University:

"The doctrine of the absolute foreknowledge of God has occasioned more perplexity and intellectual torture than any other in all the departments of theology. It has given to infidelity stronger ramparts on which to plant its batteries against divine revelation than the wily foe has been able to find anywhere else."³

§ 17. Prof. J. F. Hurst, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. Y., says:

"The 'First Principles' of Herbert Spencer cease to be a bulwark of atheism the very moment it is admitted that the Divine may be in any degree subject to limitations, . . . and be conceived of as personal."⁴

§ 18. Dr. Wilbur Fisk, Pres. of Wesleyan University, says:

"It must be determined what events will be, or there can be no foreknowledge of them."⁵

§ 19. Says Dr. John Jamieson, Scottish clergyman and lexicographer:

¹ *Philosophy of Theism*, p. 156. ² *Ibid.*, pp. 157, 158.

³ *The Foreknowledge of God*, p. 23. ⁴ *Ibid.*, Introduction, p. 11.

⁵ *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1862.

"No free being, created or uncreated can foreknow his future choices."¹

§ 20. Says Pres. Jonathan Edwards:

"If there were such things as contingencies, God could not possibly foreknow them."²

§ 21. Dr. Charles Hodge says:

"God could not see evidence where there is no evidence. And the only evidence of a future choice is God's eternal decree."³

§ 22. Says Dr. John Dick:

"Whatever is the foundation of his [God's] foreknowledge, what he does foreknow will undoubtedly take place. Hence, then, *the actions of men are as unalterably fixed from eternity, as if they had been the subject of an immutable decree.*"⁴

§ 23. If Dr. Dick's statement is true, then, it necessarily follows, that God has *caused* all the sin in the world, and is therefore the chief and only sinner.

§ 24. He further says:

"If our volitions are foreseen, we can no more avoid them than we can pluck the sun out of yonder heavens."⁵

§ 25. This is a common-sense statement. For if what God has *foreseen* does not come to pass; it would necessarily follow that his foresight was incorrect and unreliable; and consequently, not properly called foresight.

§ 26. Says Bishop Wiley:

"I see not how we can possibly escape a limited atonement, if absolute prescience be assumed."⁶

§ 27. Says Joel S. Hayes:

"A foreknowledge of free actions is as much a contradiction as a necessary free action."⁷

§ 28. Bishop Wm. Taylor says:

¹ *The Foreknowledge of God*, by L. D. McCabe, p. 287.

² *Prescience of Future Contingencies Impossible. Methodist Review*, Sept., 1892, p. 768. ³ *Ibid.*, 768.

⁴ *Theology*, Vol. I., p. 358. See J. S. Hayes, on *Foreknowledge*, p. 143.

⁵ *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 318.

⁶ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, pp. 111, 112.

⁷ *Foreknowledge of God*, by Joel S. Hayes, p. 142.

"The doctrine of foreknowledge, as taught in the Bible, . . . furnishes no legitimate ground for the speculative dogma in question"—*i. e.*, that "God's prescience is eternal and universal." He also says that it is "Impossible for him [God] to foresee, as a certainty, the unborn acts of living men, which are in their very nature uncertain; much less the moral actions of each individual of the generations that may exist in the future."² "God hath a perfect knowledge of all existing things, however remote or minute; but the unborn acts of the human will are not existing things."³

§ 29. Said John Wesley:

"I frankly confess I can offer no explanation" "how it is that God can foreknow with certainty the future choices of a free agent."⁴

§ 30. It would be perfectly safe to say, that a certain foreknowledge of "the future choices of a free agent" is utterly *impossible*; and is therefore beyond the limits of God's omniscience.

§ 31. Says the distinguished Dr. Campbell, of Scotland:

"To reconcile the divine prescience with freedom or contingency, and the consequent moral good or ill of human action, is what I have never seen achieved, and what I despair of ever seeing."⁵

§ 32. Dugald Stuart, the noted Scotch metaphysician says:

"To reconcile the freedom of the human will with the foreknowledge of God is beyond the reach of the human faculties."⁶

§ 33. It would seem that every Christian man of good understanding could fully adopt the following statement from Dr. L. D. McCabe:

"I embrace the negative because it implies no imperfection in omniscience; because it makes possible a theology without absurdities."⁷

§ 34. Says Jonathan Edwards:

"Without decree, foreknowledge could not exist."⁸

§ 35. Says Dr. Chas. Hodge:

¹ *Election of Grace*, p. 183. ² *Ibid.*, 178. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

⁴ *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 21. ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 318. ⁶ *Ibid.* ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 446.

⁸ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, Introduction, p. 8.

"There can be no certainty that does not depend upon the divine purpose."¹

§ 36. It is believed that the statement just quoted from Dr. Hodge will stand the closest criticism, and will be found to be in complete harmony with *all Bible teaching*; the eternal principles of pure reason, metaphysics and common sense. Without previous *purposing*, it is eternally impossible for omniscience to see our actions in existence or know them to be in existence, when they are *not* in existence, or before they do exist; *i. e.*, before we decide to commit them. If God's prescience is eternal and universal, then it necessarily follows that every thing included in his prescience is a *necessity*; otherwise, his prescience is uncertain. The *assumption* that God's prescience is eternal and universal makes him a monstrosity of incredible impossibilities.

§ 37. Dr. McCabe has well said :

"Who can defend the sincerity of Deity in pleading with me for half a century to be obedient, when he knew from eternity that I was certain to be lost? or in urging me to act in a momentous matter as though it were uncertain when he knew it had been infallibly certain from eternity"?²

§ 38. It may be laid down as an ultimate *fact*, that the prescience of any event before it is *purposed* is *impossible*. God *foreknows* all things which *he* has purposed, and all things purposed by *other* beings, but what is not purposed by *any one* is beyond the reach of omniscience. To say that God has purposed *every thing* that has ever taken place, is now existing, or ever will exist, is to make him the direct author of all the *crimes* as well as of all good deeds that have ever been, are now, or ever will be committed; thus making him the only one responsible for all the wickedness in the world!!

§ 39. Is the reader ready to adopt the following?

"God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass."³

¹ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, Introduction, p. 24.

² *Prescience of Future Contingencies Impossible*, p. 773.

³ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, chap. 3, sec. 1.

§ 40. The foregoing remarkable, shocking, and blasphemous conclusion was made by a council of one hundred and fifty-one men, appointed by the long British Parliament, continuing five years, seven months and twenty-one days, or from July 1st, 1643, to Feb. 22nd, 1649. This Council was composed of 121 clergymen, twenty members of the House of Commons and ten of the House of Lords. This Council was appointed to prepare a Confession of Faith for the English Church. The Council had 1163 sessions.

§ 41. They further decreed :

"Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, . . . hath chosen . . . without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions."¹

The language of the prophet Isaiah might be very properly applied to this Council: "Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees."²

§ 42. If "*God from all eternity did . . . unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass*"; then it necessarily follows, that all the crimes that have ever been committed were ordained by "God from all eternity"!! Who could reverence and love such a *monster*? Is it any wonder that men become infidels, like Mr. Ingersoll, as the result of such horrid teaching?

§ 43. If God foresaw and therefore foreknew all the actions, words and thoughts of all men before the creation of Adam; and if his foresight is perfect; does it not necessarily follow that no man could act, speak or think otherwise than in harmony with God's foresight? And does it not certainly follow, that the number of wicked deeds, words and thoughts could neither be increased or diminished? And further, if this be true, does it not also follow that man is not a free agent? and therefore not accountable for his actions, words and thoughts?

¹ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, chap. 3, sec. 5.

² Isa. 10 : 1.

§ 44. If God possessed eternally just the same, complete and certain knowledge of all the thoughts, words and deeds of all men before they were born, as he will have when they have all finished their work; could he not have judged the world just as correctly millions of years before the creation of man, as at the day appointed in the future? Is there any possible or conceivable way for God to have a knowledge of the actions, words and thoughts of the *unborn*, only by his own previous *purposing*? Will any one presume to say that "God from all eternity" purposed *all* the thoughts, words and actions of *all* men? If so, then he is responsible for all their thoughts, words and actions; and they are innocent. But such an idea is shocking and blasphemous. A theory that legitimately leads to such a conclusion should be abhorred and rejected by all sensible people.

CHAPTER II.

CERTAINTIES.

§ 45. 1. It is absolutely certain that everything is either certain or uncertain.

2. It is absolutely certain that every human being will either be saved or lost.

3. It is absolutely certain that God has or has not eternally foreseen who will be saved and who will be lost.

§ 46. 4. If God has eternally foreseen who will be saved and who will be lost; then it necessarily follows, that the number of the saved and lost has been unalterably and eternally fixed; or God's foresight is uncertain.

5. If God has eternally foreseen who will be saved and who will be lost; then there are but two conceivable theories by which to account for his eternal foresight on this subject:

§ 47. First, an arbitrary, unqualified decision that a certain number should be selected and saved "without any foresight of faith or good works . . . as conditions," as declared in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*.¹ Or (2) that he has *eternally* known who will be saved and who will be lost, because, before he had created anything, he had eternally foreseen all the actions, words and thoughts of every human being; so that we are now thinking over thoughts which have been in his mind eternally, as well as all the words we have ever spoken or shall speak.

To the first theory, there are two very strong objections:

1. It puts the character of God in such a shocking light, that

¹ Chap. 3, sec. 5.

it is utterly indefensible. 2. It is directly opposed to the plain teaching of the Bible.

To the second theory there are three very strong objections :
 1. It does violence to the principles of eternal reason and common sense. 2. It is not supported by a single passage of Scripture ; but is opposed by scores of plain Bible statements, as will be shown. 3. It virtually makes God the author of all sin. How? There is but one conceivable way for God to know the actions, words and thoughts of the unborn ; and that is, to *purpose* or *foreordain* to put certain thoughts into their minds when born, that shall cause them to speak certain words, and to perform certain actions. If this were true, then it necessarily follows that God is the sole cause of their wickedness. Without previous purposing, it is impossible to have any conception of what is nonexistent. Whatever has been seen is *fixed* and cannot be altered. If God has eternally *foreseen* all things, then they are all unalterably fixed as he saw them, or he did not see them correctly. Eternal and universal prescience and eternal and universal foreordination, "alike logically necessitate revolting imperfections in the moral character of God."¹ Eternal and universal prescience robs God "of freedom ; for he cannot choose anything different from what he has known from eternity without surrendering his prescience."² So, eternal and universal foreordination robs him of freedom, for he cannot now choose contrary to his eternal decrees. All of God's foresight involves the necessity for the existence of what he has foreseen ; otherwise, the correctness of his foresight would be impeached.

§ 48. All sight and foresight are based on what exists in *fact* or in *purpose*. Sight and foresight do not *cause* the existence of anything ; therefore, what God has simply seen or foreseen, he did not *cause* ; and if he has foreseen *everything*, then it must follow that he has not *caused anything* ; which would be denying that he had *created* anything, which is certainly a false

¹ *Prescience of Future Contingencies Impossible*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 772. *Ibid.*, p. 773.

doctrine. The error lies in the *assumption* that God's foreknowledge is based on his *foresight* instead of his *purposing*. God's prescience does not cause the event; but the cause of the event is the cause of his prescience, and that is his *purpose*. It may be stated as an *ultimate fact*, that *all divine foreknowledge is based on divine purposing*, supported by divine omnipotence. It may also be positively stated, that God has not purposed *all* the thoughts, words and actions of *all* men; and that consequently he did not foreknow from all eternity what *all* men would think, say and do before they were born.

§ 49. The following from Dr. Charles Hodge cannot be true. He says:

"The reason why any event ever comes to pass is that God so decreed it."¹

§ 50. If it were true, it would follow that he decreed that I should write what I am now writing, and everything else that any one has ever written, no matter how contradictory their statements. No sensible person could believe or trust such a God. If Dr. Hodge had said: "The reason why *some* events come to pass is that God so decreed them," it would be in harmony with the teaching of the Bible.

It is certain that the doctrine of the eternal and universal prescience of God has no foundation whatever in the eternal principles of pure reason, metaphysics, common sense or the Bible. If God's prescience is universal and eternal, then his knowledge of every event must be of the same date, which is absurd. The doctrine that "God's prescience is eternal *and universal*" embraces in its infinite scope every volition and every act of the Deity; also every action and volition, every vice and virtue, every pain and pleasure, every passion, sensation and perception, of every individual creature which ever was in existence, and which is now in existence, and which ever will be in existence; whether that creature be human or angelic, rational or irrational, animate or insensible. If it be true, that God's knowledge of every event is of the same date; then it

¹ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 168.

necessarily follows that it cannot be increased any more than infinity itself. But this view plainly contradicts the word of God; therefore, cannot be true. The Lord said to Jeremiah:

"And they [Israel] built the high places of Baal, which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire unto Molech, which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind, that they should do this abomination."¹ If God's prescience is eternal and universal; then he has eternally known the future destiny of all human beings; and, inasmuch as his knowledge is certain; it must follow that their destiny has been eternally fixed; which makes probation a *farce*. An absolute certainty cannot be predicated of an opposite possibility. If the *possibility* of salvation may be predicated of any person now under probation; then the *certainty* of the destruction of that person cannot now be predicated.

§ 51. If the prescience of God is eternal and universal, then it must include his *first* volition and action and his *last* volition and action. If it does include his first and last volition and action, then there must be an end to eternity, which cannot be true. But if his prescience does not include his first and last volition and action, then it must follow that the doctrine of eternal and universal prescience of God is opposed to the teaching of the Bible, and therefore untrue.

§ 52. God's knowledge of the actions, words and thoughts of men must be of necessity a personal acquirement; and if a personal acquirement, it must come from the outside of his own being; and if from the outside of his own being, it must be *originated*; and if originated, it cannot be eternal; therefore his prescience of man's conduct cannot be eternal. If the final destiny of all men be an object of a certain and eternal prescience; then the moral probation of human beings must be a mere deception. To be consistent, we must either reject the doctrine of eternal and universal prescience, or renounce the doctrine of human liberty and probation.

¹ Jer. 32: 35.

§ 53. In his able work, entitled *Eternal Prescience*, Mr. James Jones says:¹

"It is, I presume, agreed on by all parties, that in the order of nature, the knowledge of any fact or event must always be subsequent to its occurrence; because the fact or event itself must support the knowledge of its existence. . . . But we read of *foreknowledge*, and we believe in the existence of foreknowledge; and especially we believe that the Deity has a prescience of future events. How, then, is the subject of foreknowledge to be understood, so as to be in unison with the sentiment at the beginning of this paragraph? The purpose of bringing about a future event, and the causation that is to secure the issue are now in actual existence, and are the real objects of the Divine cognizance; but the future event, which is in reality the object of his purpose, and therefore the object of his anticipation; is expressed as though it was purely an object of *perception*. And for this reason, although foreknowledge, in strict philosophical propriety, would be absolutely inadmissible and quite unintelligible.

"Causation implies issue; and therefore the knowledge of a cause implies the anticipation of its effect. For the will and the purpose of the Deity must imply an anticipation of the consequent issue, and are a sufficient security for its future transpiration; and even if the knowledge of a principle or habit in any being must imply an anticipation of a consequent issue; and if such a knowledge be a sufficient warrant to expect that the issue will afterwards actually transpire; then there can be no impropriety in designating such anticipation by the name of foreknowledge. And this, I conceive, to be the legitimate and the only issue, in which the term prescience can be applicable to any actual knowledge, whether it be human or Divine. . . .

"The existence of the knowledge must always demonstrate the existence of the event which is the object of the knowledge; and that the predication of the knowledge, if competent and true, must demonstrate the properties of the event which is thereby presumed to be known. That which such a knowledge does formerly predicate of the event, must actually belong to the event itself; otherwise the knowledge must be incompetent and false. And therefore if the knowledge predicate neces-

¹For the thoughts in §51 and 52, I am indebted to James Jones, an able Irish minister, in his work entitled *Eternal Prescience*, published 1828.

sity, the event must be necessary; if it predicate certainty, the event must be certain; and if it predicate possibility, the event must be possible; and if it predicate contingency, the event must be contingent."¹

When the foregoing statements of Mr. Jones are carefully considered and well understood, they will be found in harmony with Bible teaching. He further says:

"Nothing can secure a certain" effect "except an infallible causation."²

§ 54. Whatever God *purposes* to do or to have done is infallible, because sustained by his own omnipotence. *All purposing contains the law of foreknowledge*; because whatever is purposed, must, of necessity, be foreseen; and *all true foresight is based on purposing*. Whenever any one purposes to do anything, that purposing is to him a foreknowledge of the action. The mechanic who purposes to build a kingly palace can give a complete description of the palace before a stroke of work has been applied to the building; but he cannot see a single thing beyond what he has *purposed*, or given a mental consideration.

¹ *Eternal Prescience*, by James Jones, pp. 37, 38. ² *Ibid.*, p. 169.

CHAPTER III.

ETERNAL NOW.

§ 55. It is claimed by some that, to God all time is one "*eternal now*," that to him there is no past, no future; therefore his "prescience is eternal and universal." It seems very strange that any careful thinker could come to such a conclusion, if he paid much attention to his Bible and the dictates of common sense.

§ 56. Says Prof. Borden P. Bowne:

"We do not hesitate to call the doctrine of foreknowledge untenable if it be assumed that time is not real."¹

§ 57. The noted thinker, Samuel Clark, says:

"We cannot conceive of the non-existence of duration."²

§ 58. Says Victor Cousin:

"Can you conceive of an event happening except in some point of duration?"³

Says Sir Wm. Hamilton:

"I hold that time and space are real conditions of things."⁴

§ 59. Dr. McCabe says:

"Barnes, Emerson, . . . Drs. Haven, Hovey, Bowen, McCosh, and hosts on hosts declare that time is an objective reality."⁵

§ 60. Dr. Noah Porter says:

"Time is the ultimate reality which makes finite existence and activity either possible or even conceivable. It is the eternal possible ground of action and creation."⁶

¹ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 278. ² *Ibid.* ³ *Ibid.*, p. 274. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 279. ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 278. ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 278.

§ 61. Dr. B. P. Bowne further says:

"A being which is in full possession of itself, so that it does not come to itself successively, would not be in time. Such a being can be conceived as having a changeless life. As such it would be without memory and without expectation; but would be in the absolute enjoyment of itself. For such a being the present alone would exist, and its *now* would be eternal."¹
 "A changeless knowledge of a changing thing is a contradiction. So knowledge of reality at any moment must embrace reality as it is; and if in the next moment reality has changed, the knowledge must change to correspond. The infinite, therefore, must be in time, so far as the world-process is concerned, as this involves sequence in both action and knowledge."²

§ 62. Has all that God has done been done at the same time? Did the knowledge of all the actions, words and thoughts of all men come to God at the same time? If not, then his knowledge of these things must have been progressive. Then it necessarily follows, that his prescience could not have been "eternal and universal."

§ 63. "Can God think a new thought? If he has thoughts, must there not be *succession*, and therefore new thoughts? Where is the degradation to believe that his thoughts are as fresh as his deeds? Is it any more dishonoring to God to believe that he is continually planning, than to believe he is working? God cannot be ignorant of what he has created. He has created things in succession; therefore he is not ignorant of succession."

§ 64. "It is eternally impossible for omniscience to see our actions in existence, or to know them to be in existence, when they are not in existence, or before they do exist; *i. e.*, before we commit them. I must exist before my actions. Hence, it is absurd to say God sees our actions in existence before we exist. To say he does, is to assert that he sees something to exist which does not exist. If he foresees they will exist, and knows they have existed after they take place, then there is fore and after with him. My actions of to-morrow do not exist to-

¹ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 283. ² *Ibid.*, p. 288.

day. God is not ignorant of their non-existence. Must God see and know *more* than all things to be omniscient? If he sees things as they are, he need not see them as they are not. He could not see them in existence *before* they exist, the same as he sees them *after* they exist. He cannot see non-existence the same as existence."

§ 65. If God does of necessity occupy at the same time every part of an infinite duration; then he must at this very moment occupy both the first and last moment of his being, which is an absolute absurdity. If all eternity is now present to God, then all eternity must have a present existence. If God's omniscience includes an actual knowledge of all his purposes and actions, past, present and future; then it must necessarily follow that all his purposes and volitions were un-originated and eternal as his own existence.

§ 66. Says the noted Dr. Dorner, in the University of Berlin, Germany:

"If he [God] cause a world to exist, it is a logical necessity that he have a positive relation to time and space. His relation to time and history must be a various relation if there be a progressive world. God cannot have an eternally similar relation to past, present and future time."¹

If all time is *now* to God, then he can have no prescience or foreknowledge. Did the knowledge of all the actions, words and thoughts of all men come to God at *once*? If not, then his knowledge of these things must have been *progressive*; therefore his prescience could not have been eternal and universal.

§ 67. Says Dr. L. D. McCabe:

"If time be an objective reality with me, it must be so with God; and if he acts in time, he does at one time what he does not do at another."²

If there is a single case of foreknowledge which was not eternal, then the statement that "God's prescience is eternal and universal" is necessarily false.

¹ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 286.

² *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 386.

§ 68. "Can God think? Either he can or he cannot. If he can, can he think a new thought? or in other words, does he know what he will think before he thinks? If he foreknew from eternity all he would ever think, then he could never have a new thought."¹

"If he does not know what he will think before he thinks; how did he know what he would think of sin before he thought of sin? God must decree what he thinks or think what he decrees. But God could not decree without thinking, and therefore his thoughts precede his decrees; hence the decrees could not be coeternal. Thus God's foreknowledge is based upon his thoughts, and a refusal to think is a refusal to know."

"Does God know what he will do before he wills to do it? If not, did he know he would save sinners before he willed to save them? Does God know how he will act before he decides to act? Does God know what he desires before he desires it? If not, did he know he would save men before he desired their salvation? Does God know all things without thinking?"

§ 69. "It is possible for God to know something that he did not know from eternity. He knew when he was creating a world and when it was created. But he could not know he was creating a thing when he was not doing it; nor could he know it was created before its creation. If it is claimed that he foreknew he would do so, it does not alter the fact that the knowledge of the action was coexistent with the act. All knowledge of events is in one sense new; for the knowledge that things have been does not exist before the actual happening."

§ 70. "Is God ignorant of contingencies? If there are any, he knows them to be such. If there are none, then man is bound by fate. It is either fixed fate or free will. If God from all eternity saw a fixed and unalterable connection in all things, then all things are mechanical. Such a view robs God of his

¹I am indebted to Bro. H. W. Bowman for these questions and propositions, which are indicated by *quotation marks*, in §63, 64, 68, 69 and 70.

attributes. He cannot save those he knows he will destroy; nor love those whom he knows he will hate; nor reveal himself to those whom he knows will always be ignorant of him. If God sees as fixed what is not fixed, he sees something where there is nothing to be seen. But this would make him see falsely."

"If God foresees that a man will be lost, it is utterly impossible for him to be saved. The attempt to save those whom he knows will be lost would be supremely ridiculous. This view makes him bound to act in accordance with his knowledge, instead of his will."

"God's power cannot perform anything contrary to his will. His will is his power, and his power is his will. His will precedes his act. God can do nothing contrary to his own nature. He cannot die because he is immortal. He can do nothing that in itself is impossible to be done. He cannot commence to do what he has already done. He cannot commence to live, think or act. He cannot create the world he has already created, nor cause a thing to be and not to be at the same time. He could not have changed Lot's wife into a pillar of salt that had stood on the plain ten years before she was born. He could not have changed Moses' rod into a serpent that was traversing the ground while the rod was in his hand. He could not change the waters of the Nile into the blood that was in the Egyptians' veins. God cannot make things which are unequal equal to each other, and at the same time have them remain unequal."

§ 71. Every man of good common sense could unite with Joseph Cook in saying:

"I can imagine that God does not exist; but I cannot imagine that time does not exist."¹

As certainly as time is a *reality*; just so certainly is it a fact that all time is not one "eternal *now*" to God. He says:

"I do set my bow in the cloud, and it *shall* be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it *shall* come to

¹ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 274.

pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow *shall* be seen in the cloud; and I *will remember* my covenant, which is between me and you, and every living creature of all flesh. . . . And the bow *shall be* in the cloud; and I *will* look upon it, that I may *remember* the everlasting covenant."¹

Could the Lord truthfully say this, if to him all time was one "eternal now"? If there were no *past time* to him, could he have any *memory*? If God has ever done a *new* thing, had a *new* thought or *remembers* anything, then it certainly follows, that to him all time is not one eternal now; neither is his pre-science eternal and universal. Referring to the destruction of Korah and his sympathizers, Moses said:

§ 72. "If these men die the common death of all men; . . . then the Lord hath not sent me; but if the Lord make a *new* thing, and the earth open her mouth, and swallow them up, . . . and they go down quick [or alive] into the *pit* [*sheol*—the grave], then ye shall understand that these have provoked the Lord. And it came to pass, as he had made an end of speaking, . . . that the ground clave asunder that was under them; and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up."²

This earthquake was a "new thing." Referring back to the flood, God said:

"I will *remember* my covenant, which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh. . . . The bow shall be in the cloud and I will look upon it, that I may *remember* the everlasting covenant."³ When the children of Israel were enduring their cruel bondage in Egypt, we read:

"God heard their groaning, and God *remembered* his covenant with Abraham, and Israel and with Jacob."⁴ If all time were one "eternal *now*" to God, there would be no possibility for the use of memory. In order to be considered "orthodox," must we embrace theories that do violence to the eternal principles of pure reason, metaphysics, common sense and the Bible? or shall we believe the Lord's plain statements?

¹ Gen. 9: 13-16. ² Num. 16: 29-32. ³ Gen. 9: 15, 16. ⁴ Ex. 4: 24.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GOLDEN MEAN.

§ 73. Any system supported by a single *fact* cannot be false.

Any system supported by a single *error* cannot be true.

Mohammedanism, Calvinism, Arminianism, Phariseeism and Sadduceeism, are each supported by an eternal truth and an eternal error; therefore they are all false.

§ 74. The eternal truth in Mohammedanism: "One God." The eternal error: "Mohammed is his prophet."

§ 75. The eternal truth in Calvinism: All *positive* Bible prophecy is infallible. The eternal error: All *conditional* prophecy is infallible.

§ 76. The eternal truth in Arminianism: God's foreknowledge or foresight covers all *positive* prophecy. The eternal error: God's foreknowledge or foresight also covers all *conditional* prophecy.

§ 77. The eternal truth in Phariseeism: God will raise the dead. The eternal error: The soul is immortal.

§ 78. The eternal truth in Sadduceeism: The entire man is mortal and unconscious in *sheol*. The eternal error: There is no resurrection of the dead.

§ 79. Conclusion. There is **not** a single fact or truth to sustain Mohammedanism, Calvinism, Arminianism, Phariseeism or Sadduceeism. Calvinists and Arminians are both right on *positive* prophecy; and both wrong on *conditional* prophecy.

The Calvinist says:

"God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass."¹

The Arminian says:

"All was foreseen, foreknown, provided against, from the conception of the malicious temptation in the Satanic vileness to his ultimate and eternal discomfiture."

§ 80. Many good doctrines, including holiness and the second coming of Christ, have been carried to such extremes by some, as to make them obnoxious and even shocking to sensible and devoted Christians. This is true of the views which some have of "Our God." There is a *golden mean* that commends itself to all thoughtful people, who will adhere closely to the Bible and common sense, which always agree.

§ 81. 1. It may be safely stated that God is *limited* and *controlled* by the eternal principles of his eternal attributes.

2. Because of his eternal attribute of *wisdom*, he can never become *unwise*.

3. Because of his eternal attribute of *truthfulness*, he can never become a *liar*.

4. Because of his eternal attribute of *honesty*, he can never become *dishonest*.

5. Because of his eternal attribute of *mercy*, he can never become *unmerciful*, *cruel* or *vengeful*.

6. Because of his eternal attribute of *honor*, he can never become *dishonorable*.

7. Because of his eternal attribute of *justice*, he can never become *unjust*.

8. Because of his eternal attribute of *love*, he can never become *unloving* or *unlovely*.

9. Because of his eternal attribute of *omnipotence*, he can never become *weak*.

10. Because of his eternal attribute of *holiness*, he can never become *unholy*.

¹ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, chap. 3, sec. 1.

11. Because of his eternal attribute of *meekness*, he can never become *proud*.

12. Because of his eternal attribute of *omniscience*, he can never become ignorant of what is *knowable*.

There seems to be no way to avoid the conclusion, that God is limited *only* by *impossibilities*, which are the *necessary* results of the eternal principles of his eternal attributes.

Knowledge is dependent upon its possessor for its own existence. Knowledge is a perception of what has been, is, or is to be. It must first be true that the thing known certainly *has been*, or certainly *is now*, or certainly is *going* to be, before there can be a perception of that certainty; and consequently, the certainty of the thing causes the knowledge of said certainty. The knowledge is caused by the certainty, and not the certainty by the knowledge; and it is equally certain whether known or unknown.

§ 82. God's knowledge of what a free agent will do depends, therefore, on the certainty that he will do it; and until the certainty exists, God cannot know it, inasmuch as neither God nor man can know anything where there is nothing to be known.

If God foreknows *whatsoever* comes to pass, does not his foreknowledge of what a man will do make it certain that he will do it? And if so, can he be free to do any differently?

Admitting that Adam's sin was unknown to God before he made man utterly spoils the infidel's charge against the wisdom, justice and mercy of the Creator. No wise person would make a machine, if he knew before he made it, that it would be a *failure*. If God foreknew what all men would do, say and think, before they were born; would it be consistent for him to "*prove*" them in order to "*know* . . . whether" they would "keep his commandments"? Moses was instructed to say to the children of Israel:

"Thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to *prove* thee, to *know* what was in thine heart, *whether* thou wouldest keep his commandments, or no."¹ Again, we read:

¹ Deut. 8 : 2.

"God left him [Hezekiah] to *try* him, that he *might know* all that was in his heart."¹

Is it possible to harmonize such Scriptures as these with the doctrine that God's foresight is "*eternal and universal*"? Would God have *tried* Abraham had he known perfectly all his future actions?

§ 83. Is it possible for God to see, hear, know or foreknow that which does not exist in *fact* or *purpose*?

When God *causes* something to be done, does his foreknowledge of that thing exist in the *decision* to cause it, or in previous *foresight*? If it be asked, which is *first*, cause or effect? every intelligent person would answer *cause*. Can God have a knowledge of any event before the *cause* exists necessary to produce the event? The answer must be, *impossible*. Let him speak for himself:

"Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I *will bring evil* upon this place and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read; *because* they have forsaken me, and have burned incense unto other gods, that they might provoke me to anger with all the works of their hands; *therefore* my wrath shall be kindled against this place, and shall not be quenched. But to the king² of Judah which sent you to inquire of the Lord, thus shall ye say to him, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, As touching the words which thou hast heard; *because* thine heart was tender, and thou hast humbled thyself before the Lord, *when* thou heardest what I spake against this place, and against the inhabitants thereof, that they should become a desolation and a curse, and hast rent thy clothes, and wept before me; I also have heard thee, saith the Lord. Behold, *therefore*, I *will* gather thee unto thy fathers, and thou *shalt* be gathered into thy grave in peace."³

§ 84. Observe, the Lord says:

"I *will* bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants, . . . *because* they have forsaken me." He does not intimate that he ever had a thought of bringing evil upon them till *after*

¹ 2 Chron. 32 : 31. ² Josiah. ³ 2 Kings 22 : 16-20.

they forsook him. That was the *cause* that led him to *purpose* evil against them. It is not conceivable that an effect can be known before the *cause exists*; and when the effect is caused by the *free choice* of any person, it is impossible to know that cause or effect before the existence of that person.

The Lord did not say to king Josiah, "*because I foresee* that thy heart *will be* tender, and that thou *wilt* humble thyself, . . . *therefore* I will gather thee . . . into thy grave in peace"; but "*because* thine heart *was* tender, and thou *hast* humbled thyself." In this case, the *cause* for the Lord's decision had no existence *before* the lifetime of Josiah. Is it reasonable to say the Lord bases his actions upon moral deeds which have no existence? A theology resting upon such a foundation is unworthy of the confidence or support of any sensible person. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will bring upon this city and upon all her towns all the evil that I have pronounced against it, *because* they *have* hardened their necks, that they might not hear my words."¹

Again, says the Lord: "Surely there shall not one of these men of this evil generation see that good land, which I swear to give unto your fathers, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh; he shall see it, and to him will I give the land he hath trodden upon, and to his children, *because* he *hath* wholly followed the Lord."² When God swore to give the land of Canaan to the children of Israel, had he then *foreseen* all their thoughts, words and actions? If so, why did he change his mind, and say, "Surely . . . not one of these men" shall "see that good land, . . . save Caleb"? The simple fact is, his promise was a *conditional prophecy*, based on their future conduct. He instructed Moses to say:

"It shall come to pass, *if* thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth; . . . and the Lord shall make thee plenteous in goods, . . . in

¹ Jer. 19: 15. ² Deut. 1: 35, 36.

the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers. . . . But it shall come to pass, *if* thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee."¹

Why did the Lord use the word *if* in relation to their future conduct, if it had been eternally *foreseen*? Is there any *if* in perfect foreknowledge? Is the word *if* ever used correctly, when there is not an *uncertainty*? Were conditional prophecies removed from the Bible, many pages would be missing. Probably, full half of the Bible prophecies are *conditional*. Whenever the word *if* is introduced, in connection with the prophecy, it is conditional. *All conditional Bible prophecies are the result of divine PURPOSING, conditioned by human decisions.*

§ 85. Says the Lord: "At what instant I *shall* speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy; *if* that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I *will* *repent* of the evil that I *thought* to do unto them. And what instant I *shall* speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; *if* it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, *then* I *will* *repent* of the good, wherewith I *said* I would benefit them."²

Can any one fail to see that this Scripture forever settles the fact, that all time is not to him one eternal *now*. Could *conditional prophecy* be expressed in a more simple or plainer manner, than in the verses just quoted? If the Lord does not mean what he says, what does he mean? If the Lord's prescience has been *eternal* and *universal*, how could he truthfully say what we have just read? How could he use the word *if* when there is no uncertainty?

§ 86. Take the case of the Ninevites. The Lord sent Jonah to say: "Yet forty days, and Ninevah shall be overthrown."³ This startling proclamation caused the king to proclaim a general fast; saying: "Who can tell if God will turn and repent,

¹ Deut. 28 : 1, 11, 15. ² Jer. 18 : 7-10. ³ Jonah 3 : 4

and turn away from his fierce anger, that we perish not? And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God *repented* of the evil that he had *said* that he would do unto them; and he did it not."¹ Why did he *repent* "of the evil that he had *said* that he would do unto them"? Because they "believed God, and proclaimed a fast," and turned "every one from his evil way."² Did the Lord know he would change his purpose towards the Ninevites, before the fast was proclaimed? In this case, he did just as he said he would when "a nation . . . turn from their evil";³ but to say, he knew he would repent when he sent Jonah to declare their destruction, would be putting him in a condition that no good person could respect. Shall we support a theory that compels us to put "Our God" in such a shocking situation?

§ 87. The Lord said to Samuel: "It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king; for he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments."⁴ Say to him: "*Because* thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king."⁵ Did God eternally foresee just what Saul would do? If so, why did he have him made king? Why did he not repent before he made him king? Would any sensible person employ a man to do a piece of work, if he knew before he hired him, that he would make a complete failure?

§ 88. The Lord said of Solomon: "I will establish his kingdom for ever, *if* he be constant to do my commandments and my judgments, as at this day."⁶ If God's foresight is "eternal and universal," then how could there be any *if* in the matter? Who can defend the word of the Lord in these cases, provided, it is true that he foresaw everything before anything was done? It is plainly declared in the Bible that Solomon departed from the Lord; and we know that the Jewish kingdom came to an end more than eighteen hundred years ago.

All these cases are plain and in harmony with the Bible and

¹Jonah 3: 9, 10. ²Jonah 3: 5, 8. ³Jer. 18: 7, 8. ⁴1 Sam. 15: 11.
⁵Verse 23. ⁶1 Chron. 28: 7.

common sense, when we admit the incontrovertible proposition, that *it is not within the realm of omniscience to know the future choices of free agents, acting under the law of liberty.*

§ 89. Respecting Israel, the Lord said: That "through them [the nations] I may *prove* Israel, *whether* they will keep the way of the Lord to walk therein, as their fathers did keep it, or not. Therefore the Lord left those nations, without driving them out hastily."¹ If the Lord had a perfect foreknowledge of all the actions, words and thoughts of the Israelites, would he need to "*prove*" them in order to find out "*whether* they will keep the way of the Lord"? Such an idea is preposterous! Let us not try to prove that our Lord is destitute of common sense in the management of this world.

Whatever is seen or foreseen must exist really or mentally; but the thoughts, words and actions of the unborn have no real or mental existence; therefore, they cannot be seen or foreseen, unless previously purposed by the Lord. Would any one venture to say that the Lord eternally purposed *all* the thoughts, words and actions of *all* men? If such a monstrous theory were true, it would make God the direct author of all the wickedness in the world.

Does God know what he will think before he thinks? or know what he will do before he purposes? Before we were born, did he purpose that you should be saved and that I should be lost? Did he purpose at *once* all he has done or will do? Can he see his own plans before he purposes? Can he foresee and think about anything before it comes into his mind? Common sense must answer *No* to all these questions; and the Bible will respond, *Amen* to the answer.

Speaking of the Jews, the Lord says: "They built the high places of Baal, which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire unto Molech; which I commanded them not, *neither came it into my mind*, that they should do this abomination, to cause Judah to sin."² If the Lord had *purposed* to have them commit

¹ Judges 2 : 22, 23. ² Jer. 32 : 35.

those abominations or eternally *foreseen* that they would commit them, could he speak the truth and say: "Neither came it into my mind, that they should do this abomination"? Referring to the same thing, he says again: "Neither came it into my heart."¹ "Neither came it into my mind."² Will any one presume to contradict these plain statements, and say that God had eternally foreseen all that the Jews did in the valley of Hinnom?

§ 90. When the world became so wicked, that only *one* righteous family remained upon the whole earth, among some twelve hundred millions³ of inhabitants, we find the following statement:

"And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them."⁴ The Septuagint reads: "I am grieved that I made them." Had he let that state of things continue till Noah and his family were dead, then there would not have been a righteous person left.

If God had eternally foreseen all the wickedness of the antediluvians, before he made man; why did he make him, if he knew *before* his creation that he would repent *afterwards*?

§ 91. If "God's prescience is eternal and universal," then it must follow, that when he created the angels, he knew that one of them would become a *devil*; and that he would lead many other angels into sin; and that he would also cause the first man and woman to sin, and thus introduce wickedness into the newly created world. Question: Why did he create *that* angel, if he knew what he would do, before his creation?

¹ Jer. 7: 31. ² Jer. 19: 5.

³ This is the *lowest* estimate I have seen. Others say sixteen hundred millions. ⁴ Gen. 6: 6, 7.

Without previous *purposing*, is there a single text in the Bible; which teaches that God knows the thoughts of any one before he thinks them? or that he hears the words of any one before they are spoken? or that he knows the actions of any one before they have any existence? It is certainly safe to say, that *the future choices of free agents, acting under the law of liberty are UNKNOWABLE, and therefore do not come within the range of omniscience.* All the mental, moral and physical laws and the laws of nature are the manifestation of God's *purposes*.

I agree with Dr. L. D. McCabe, when he says:

"God knows all things that have ever existed, that now exist, and that ever will exist as the result of existing causes acting in the line of cause and effect; and all that he has purposed to bring into existence."¹

§ 92. Said John Calvin:

"All the descendants of Adam fell by the divine will into that miserable condition in which they now are."² "Christ redeemed only those who were chosen to salvation from eternity."³

Does the reader accept these statements? If they are true, then the Bible is very misleading in its teachings. Said Jesus: "Come unto me, *all* ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."⁴ Is it true, that none are "heavy laden," excepting "those who were chosen to salvation from eternity"? If there are any others who are "heavy laden," Jesus has given them an invitation to come, which either spoils Calvin's statement, or makes Christ a deceiver, if he invites those to come to him, when he knew they could not come.

The following are about the last words we have from Jesus:

"The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come; and *whosoever will*, let him take the water of life freely."⁵ But if God has eternally *foreseen* who will be saved and who will be lost, can the number be changed if his foresight was correct?

¹ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, Introduction, p. 24.

² *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 186. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

⁴ Matt. 11 : 28. ⁵ Rev. 22 : 17.

Says Paul: "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for *every man*."¹ Then it necessarily follows that "*whosoever will*," may come, and through him secure salvation. Said Jesus: "If *any man* thirst, let him come unto me and drink."² Again he says: "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life."³ How could they come, if God had "eternally foreseen" that they would not come? If any one of that class should come to Christ, whom God eternally foresaw would not come, it would spoil the correctness of God's foresight; and thus make it forever unreliable. A theory that drives us to such conclusions should have no place in the doctrine of Christianity.

¹ Heb. 2 : 9. ² John 7 : 37. ³ John 5 : 40.

CHAPTER V.

CONDITIONAL PROPHECY.

§ 93. The Lord said: "It *may be* that the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I *purpose* to do unto them; that they may return every man from his evil way; that I may forgive their iniquity and their sin."¹ Observe, he does not say, I *foresee* the evil that is coming upon "the house of Judah"; but it is "evil which I *purpose* to do unto them."

Again he says: "If so be they will hearken, and turn every man from his evil way, that I may repent me of the evil, which I *purpose* to do unto them *because* of the evil of their doings."² This is called *prophecy* in verses 9, 11 and 12. The words "may be" and "if" certainly imply *conditions*; therefore, this is conditional prophecy. If the Lord had eternally foreseen that they would "hearken," or that they would not "hearken"; then the words "may be" and "if" were not used correctly, and are misleading. But he gave as a reason why he had *purposed* to bring evil upon the house of Judah, that it was "*because* of the evil of their doings." We must admit that the *cause* precedes the *effect*. This cause could not have been *eternal*; therefore, he could not have eternally *foreseen* that he would bring evil upon the house of Judah, for the reason that the *cause* did not exist *before* the existence of the house of Judah. He does not say I *foresee*; but "I *purpose*" to bring evil upon them, *if* they will not "hearken and turn every man from his evil way." What can be more clearly intimated, than that

¹ Jer. 36 : 3. ² Jer. 26 : 3.

the Lord's *purpose* depended upon the uncertain action of the house of Judah? *If* they would "hearken" to him; then he would "repent . . . of the evil" which he had purposed to bring upon them; but *if* they did not repent, then the evil would follow. Their action would cause the Lord to make his decision. It seems impossible to harmonize the Lord's words with the assumption that "his foresight is eternal and universal."

§ 94. There are *scores* of examples in the Bible like the foregoing. "Says the Lord: "It shall come to pass, *if* they will diligently learn the ways of my people, . . . then shall they be built in the midst of my people. But *if* they will not obey, I will utterly pluck up and destroy that nation saith the Lord."¹

"*If* my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land. But *if* ye turn away, and forsake my statutes and my commandments, . . . then will I pluck them up by the roots out of my land which I have given them; and this house, which I have sanctified for my name, will I cast out of my sight, and will make it to be a proverb and a byword among all nations."² This has been done. They did not "humble themselves," but turned away from the Lord and forsook his statutes and commandments. When they did that, the *if* was removed in the mind of the Lord, and what was before *conditional* prophecy, then became *positive*.

§ 95. The Lord instructed the prophet Jeremiah to say to Judah: "Amend your ways and your doings, and obey the voice of the Lord your God; and the Lord will *repent* him of the evil that he hath pronounced against you."³ This certainly teaches that *if* they would amend their ways, the Lord would change his *purpose*.

What the Lord has *purposed*, he can change at pleasure; but what he has *seen* or *foreseen* cannot be changed. The thing must exist just as it was seen, or else it was not seen cor-

¹ Jer. 12 : 16, 17. ² 2 Chron. 7 : 14, 19, 20. ³ Jer. 26 : 13.

rectly. What has been *seen* or *foreseen* cannot be *unseen*. It is a positive fixture; otherwise, it was not seen.

We read: "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah . . . came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live. Then he turned his face to the wall, and prayed unto the Lord, saying, I beseech thee, O Lord, remember now how I have walked before thee in truth and with a perfect heart. . . . And Hezekiah wept sore. And it came to pass, afore Isaiah was gone out of the middle court, that the word of the Lord came to him saying, Turn again, and tell Hezekiah the captain of my people, Thus saith the Lord, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears; behold, I will heal thee, . . . and will add unto thy days fifteen years."¹ Was all this eternally *foreseen*, before King Hezekiah had any existence?

Why did God change his *purpose* in this case? Because of the prayer and tears of Hezekiah. This is too plain to admit of any doubt.

"God said unto Balaam, Thou shalt not go with them" [the messengers of Balak]. A little while afterwards, we read: "And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, *If* the men [the messengers of Balak] come to call thee, rise up, and go with them."²

Had the Lord eternally *foreseen* that he would tell Balaam not to go, and then change his mind and tell him to go; would he have put in an *if*, conditioned upon the action of those messengers?

§ 96. "Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed thy house [house of Eli], and the house of thy father, should walk before me for ever; but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me."³ Did God eternally foresee that the house of Eli "should walk before" him "for ever"? and then afterwards, eternally foresee that his house should be overthrown? The obvious facts are, that because of the misconduct of Eli, God

¹ 2 Kings 20: 1-6. ² Num. 22: 12, 20. ³ 1 Sam. 2: 30.

changed his *purpose* in relation to the continuance of his house.

The Lord said of Solomon: "*If* thou wilt walk before me, as David thy father walked, . . . then I will establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel for ever, as I promised David thy father, saying, There shall not fail thee a man upon the throne of Israel."¹ If the Lord had eternally *foreseen* all the conduct of Solomon, how could there be any room for an *if* in the matter?

§ 97. The Lord said to Israel: "*If* ye shall at all turn from following me, ye or your children, and will not keep my commandments and my statutes which I have set before you, but go and serve other gods, and worship them; then will I cut off Israel out of the land which I have given them."²

We must admit that the word *IF* *always implies uncertainty*. Were it true, that the Lord had eternally foreseen all the wickedness of Israel, does it look reasonable that he would use such words concerning them, as has just been quoted? Again he says: "*If* thou wilt return, O Israel, saith the Lord, return unto me; and *if* thou wilt put away thine abominations out of my sight, then shalt thou not remove."³ If he knew they would not return, would it be proper for him to use the word *if*? A theory that requires us to put our God in such a bad light cannot be true.

We read: "Hezekiah besought the Lord, and the Lord *repented* him of the evil which he had pronounced against them" [Judah].⁴ In this case he changed his *purpose*; not his foresight.

§ 98. The Lord required Jeremiah to say to Judah: "*If* ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings; *if* ye thoroughly execute judgment between a man and his neighbor; *if* ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your hurt; then will I cause you to dwell in this place,

¹ Kings 9: 4, 5. ² 1 Kings 9: 6, 7. ³ Jer. 4: 1. ⁴ Jer. 26: 19.

in the land that I gave to your fathers, for ever and ever."¹ How could *conditional prophecy* be more clearly stated than in this Scripture? Would the Lord be justified in using these *ifs*, provided he had *foreseen* all the conduct of the Jews? As this Scripture now stands, it certainly teaches that God could not decide what to do for them till *after* they had decided what course they would pursue.

Again we read: "The Lord your God *proveth* you, to *know* whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul."² It would be folly to prove that which was already perfectly known. No sensible person would do such an unnecessary thing.

The Lord said of Israel: "They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and *I knew it not*."³ *Let it be forever remembered, that it is beyond the limits of omniscience to know the future choices of free agents, acting under the law of liberty.* Then the perplexing difficulties of this subject are entirely removed. This is one of the eternal laws regulating the conditions of foreknowledge.

God said to Israel: "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, *if* ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day; and a curse, *if* ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God."⁴ According to this statement of the Lord, he could not decide whether to bestow a blessing or a curse upon Israel, till after they had made their decision. The *if* was under their control.

§ 99. When the children of Israel were about to leave Egypt under the leading of Moses, he said to the Lord: "They will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee."⁵ Then the Lord informed him that he would help him to perform two miraculous signs for the purpose of convincing the Israelites that

¹ Jer. 7: 5-7. ² Deut. 13: 3. ³ Hosea 8: 4. ⁴ Deut. 11. 26-28.
⁵ Exod. 4: 1.

Moses was sent by God to lead them out of Egyptian bondage. He then said to Moses: "It shall come to pass, *if* they will not believe thee, neither hearken to the voice of the *first sign*, that they will believe the voice of the *latter sign*. And it shall come to pass, *if* they will not believe also these *two signs*, neither hearken unto thy voice, that thou shalt take of the water of the river, and pour it upon the dry land; and the water which thou takest out of the river shall become blood upon the dry land."¹ How can this be harmonized with the theory that "God's prescience is eternal and universal"? and that he knew all the thoughts, words and actions of all men before they were born?

§ 100. The Lord said to the prophet Ezekiel: "When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; *if* he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it. Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; *if* he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right; *if* the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die."² Do not these *ifs* afford positive proof that the Lord has not eternally known who will be saved and who will be lost? Does he use the word *if* when there is no uncertainty? There can be no *if* in perfect foreknowledge, or positive prophecy, which is yet to be considered.

§ 101. When the children of Israel had been delivered from their Egyptian bondage, the Lord said to them: "Now therefore, *if* ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation."³ When the Lord said this to Israel, did he know they would not obey his voice, nor keep his covenant? If so, why did he use the word *if*, thus expressing an *uncertainty*?

¹ Exod. 4: 8, 9. ² Ezek. 33: 13-15. ³ Exod. 19: 5, 6.

Again he says: "But *if* ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all these commandments; and *if* ye shall despise my statutes, or *if* your soul abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, but that ye break my covenant; I also will do this unto you; I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague; . . . and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it; and I will set my face against you, and ye shall be slain before your enemies. . . . And *if* ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sin."¹ "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and will do that which is right in his sight, and will give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians."² "And it shall come to pass *if* ye shall hearken diligently unto my commandments which I command you this day, . . . that I will give you the rain of your land in his due season."³ "The Lord shall establish thee a holy people unto himself, as he hath sworn unto thee, *if* thou shalt keep the commandments of the Lord thy God, and walk in his ways. . . . And the Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath; *if* that thou hearken unto the commandments of the Lord thy God, which I command thee this day. . . . *If* thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, . . . then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, . . . even great plagues, and of long continuance."⁴ "And it shall be, *if* thou do at all forget the Lord thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them, and worship them, I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish, . . . *because* ye would not be obedient unto the voice of the Lord your God."⁵

The word *because* means, for the cause, or the cause is. It is an eternal principle that the cause always precedes the effect. In all these cases the *cause* was *undeveloped* and *uncertain* when

¹ Lev. 26: 14-18. ² Exod. 15: 26. ³ Deut. 11: 13. ⁴ Deut. 28: 9, 13, 58, 59. ⁵ Deut. 8: 19, 20.

the Lord used these *ifs*; and consequently, the *effect* could not be determined by him till after Israel and Judah had made their free decision whether they would obey or disobey. As soon as their decision was made, then the *cause* existed that would secure the *effect*. If all their conduct had been eternally *foreseen* by God; then, of necessity, they must have done as they did, provided his foresight was correct; then where is there any room for an *if* to be used?

"The word of the Lord came to Solomon, saying, Concerning this house which thou art in building, *if* thou wilt walk in my statutes, and execute my judgments, and keep all my commandments to walk in them; then will I perform my word with thee, which I spake unto David thy father, and I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will not forsake my people."¹ "And as for thee, *if* thou wilt walk before me, as David thy father walked, . . . then will I stablish the throne of thy kingdom, according as I have covenanted with David thy father. . . . But *if* ye turn away, and forsake my statutes and my commandments, which I have set before you, and shall go and serve other gods, and worship them; then will I pluck them [Israel] up by the roots out of my land which I have given them; and this house, which I have sanctified for my name, will I cast out of my sight, and will make it a proverb and a byword among all nations. And this house, which is high, shall be an astonishment to every one that passeth by it; so that he shall say, Why hath the Lord done thus unto this land, and unto this house? And it shall be answered, *Because* they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, and laid hold on other gods."² When the Lord was saying this to Solomon, and using these *ifs*, did he then *know* that Solomon and all Israel would disobey his commandments, and worship the gods of the heathen? To say that he did know, would be charging him with gross deception in his language.

¹ 1 Kings 6: 11-13. ² 2 Chron. 7: 17-22.

§ 102. The Lord sent the prophet Ahijah to Jeroboam, saying: "Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Behold, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee. . . . And it shall be, *if* thou wilt hearken unto all that I command thee, and wilt walk in my ways, and do that is right in my sight, to keep my statutes and my commandments, as David my servant did; then I will be with thee, and build thee a sure house, as I built David, and will give Israel unto thee."¹

Jeroboam was the *first* king over the ten tribes of Israel, after they separated from the house of Judah, soon after the death of Solomon. Jeroboam departed from the Lord, became a gross idolater, and led the house of Israel also into idolatry. Had the Lord *foreseen* from all eternity that Jeroboam would become an idolater, would he have chosen him to be king, and addressed him as in the Scripture just quoted? Such a conclusion would be *preposterous!* and a libel on the character of "Our God."

§ 103. When Saul, the first king over the twelve tribes of Israel, was chosen king, Samuel was directed by the Lord to say to the children of Israel: "*If* ye will fear the Lord, and serve him, and obey his voice, and not rebel against the commandment of the Lord; then shall both ye and also the king that reigneth over you continue following the Lord your God. But *if* ye will not obey the voice of the Lord, but rebel against the commandment of the Lord; then shall the hand of the Lord be against you, as it was against your fathers."² "And it shall come to pass, *if* ye diligently hearken unto me saith the Lord; . . . then shall there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David; . . . and this city shall remain for ever. . . . But *if* ye will not hearken unto me; . . . then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem and it shall not be quenched."³ They did not hearken unto the Lord, and in A. D. 70 the temple at

¹ 1 Kings 11: 31, 38. ² 1 Sam. 12: 14, 15. ³ Jer. 17: 24-27

Jerusalem was burnt by the Roman army under Titus. Was this burning of Jerusalem eternally *foreseen*; or was it the result of God's *purpose*, in case the Jews would "not hearken" unto him and obey his commands? But *one* sensible answer can be given; it was the result of God's *purpose*, because of their disobedience.

§ 104. "Thus saith the Lord: . . . *If* ye will still abide in this land, then I will build you, and not pull you down; and I will plant you, and not pluck you up; for I *repent* me of the evil that I have done unto you."¹ *Repentance* always implies a *change of mind*. If the Lord ever changes his mind, then he must have some new thoughts; and if he has any new thoughts; it necessarily follows that *all* his thoughts are *not eternal*; consequently, his "prescience is not eternal and universal." "God sent an angel unto Jerusalem to destroy it; and as he was destroying, the Lord beheld, and he *repented* him of the evil, and said to the angel that destroyed, It is enough, stay now thine hand."² "Turn unto the Lord your God; for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and *repenteth* him of the evil."³ "Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may *prove* them, whether they will walk in my law or no."⁴ Had the Lord eternally known all their thoughts, why should he "*prove* them," to know whether they would walk in his law? "And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, Lest, peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt."⁵ Is there any "*peradventure*" in perfect foreknowledge? "Thou hast forsaken me, saith the Lord, thou art gone backward; therefore will I stretch out my hand against thee, and destroy thee; I am weary with repenting."⁶ The Lord said to the prophet Ezekiel: "Prepare thee stuff for removing,

¹ Jer. 42: 9, 10. ² 1 Chron. 21: 15. ³ Joel 2: 13. ⁴ Exod. 16: 4.
⁵ Exod. 13: 17. ⁶ Jer. 15: 6.

and remove by day in their [the Jews'] sight; and thou shalt remove from thy place to another place in their sight; it *may be* they will consider though they be a rebellious house."¹ Is there any "may be" connected with that which is perfectly known?

§ 105. "And it came to pass . . . that God did tempt [or try] Abraham; and he said, . . . Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, . . . and offer him . . . for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." Abraham promptly obeyed, and was about to slay his son, when God said: "Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him; for *now I know* that thou fearest God."² If the Lord had eternally known all the actions, words and thoughts of Abraham; why did he try him; and then say after the trial, "*now I know*"?

"It came to pass when Rehoboam had established the kingdom, and strengthened himself, he forsook the law of the Lord, and all Israel with him. . . . In the fifth year of king Rehoboam, Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem, *because* they had transgressed against the Lord. . . . Thus saith the Lord, Ye have forsaken me, and therefore have I also left you in the hand of Shishak. Whereupon the princes of Israel and the king humbled themselves. . . . And *when* the Lord *saw* that they humbled themselves, the word of the Lord came to Shemaiah, saying, They have humbled themselves, *therefore* I will not destroy them."³ How can this be harmonized with the idea that all this had been *eternally* foreseen? The *origin* of an event cannot be before the *cause* by which it was produced. The reason why God sent Shishak against Jerusalem was "*because*" the people had "transgressed" against him; and for that *cause*, he said he had left them "in the hand of Shishak." Then "the princes . . . and the king humbled themselves. . . . And *when* the Lord *saw* that they humbled themselves," he changed his mind, and said, "I will not destroy them." How could it be more clearly stated, that God did not see that they

¹ Ezek. 12 : 3. ² Gen. 22 : 1, 2, 12. ³ 2 Chron. 12 : 1-7.

"humbled themselves" till *after* King Shishak came against Jerusalem? It was utterly impossible for him to know they would "humble themselves" before the *cause* existed that led them to humiliation; unless he had previously *purposed* to force them to "humble themselves," which would make the whole affair a mere farce.

§ 106. It would seem useless to burden the reader with any more examples of "conditional prophecy" found in the Bible. If these scores of *ifs* are not sufficient to prove the case, then no number would be satisfactory. The word *if* always implies *condition* and *uncertainty*, when used correctly. Yet all these conditional prophecies become *positive*, whenever the *if* is removed by the action of those on the *human* side. When their decision is *final*, then the Lord's is also *final*. This is the only conceivable method of righteous government.

CHAPTER VI.

POSITIVE PROPHECY.

§ 107. In the positive prophecies of the Bible there are no *conditions*, nor *uncertainties*, because they are supported by God's unfailing omnipotence.

We read: "The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, *Surely* as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have *purposed* so shall it stand; that I will break the Assyrian in my land, and upon my mountain tread him under foot; then shall his yoke depart from off them [the Jews], and his burden depart from off their shoulders. This is the *purpose* that is *purposed* upon the whole earth; and this is the hand that is stretched out upon all the nations. For the Lord of hosts hath *purposed*, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?"¹ "Every *purpose* of the Lord shall be performed against Babylon to make the land of Babylon a desolation without an inhabitant."² There are no *ifs* in positive prophecy. *All PURPOSING is accompanied by foreknowledge, equal to the extent of the purposing.* "Now the Lord had told Samuel . . . a day before Saul came, saying, Tomorrow about this time, I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over my people Israel, that he may save my people out of the hand of the Philistines; for I have looked upon my people, because their cry is come unto me."³

§ 108. Referring to the dream of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, Joseph said to his brethren: "And for that the dream was

¹ Isa. 14: 24-27. ² Jer. 51: 29. ³ 1 Sam. 9: 15, 16.

doubled unto Pharaoh twice; it is because the thing is *established* by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass."¹ "But as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God *meant* it for good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive."² Observe, it is not said that God *foresaw* that Joseph would be sold into Egypt, but "the thing was *established* by God," in order "to save much people alive." This is a clear case of God's *purposing*; and all purposing contains the law of foreknowledge.

§ 109. God said to Moses: "*Certainly* I will be with thee; and this shall be a token unto thee, that I have sent thee; when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain."³ God's *purpose* constituted the *certainty*; because of his omnipotence. "Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am the Lord, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians; and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched-out arm, and with great judgments, . . . and I will bring you unto the land, concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I will give it to you for a heritage; I am the Lord."⁴ The Lord does not say, I *foresaw* that I would give the land to Abraham; but, "I did *swear* to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob." He *purposed* to give it to them for an inheritance; and no one could prevent him from accomplishing his purpose, because he has almighty power.

Inasmuch, as all admit there is a large amount of *positive* prophecy in the Bible, it would be useless to cite further examples. All prophecy may be considered *positive*, when no *conditions* are mentioned or implied. Such are the prophecies of Daniel and John.

§ 110. Bible prophecies may be divided into four classes: 1, positive; 2, conditional; 3, consecutive, and 4, discursive. (1) Prophecies in which no conditions are expressed or implied. (2) Prophecies which are conditional on the conduct of those on the human side. (3) Prophecies consisting of a

¹ Gen. 41: 32. ² Gen. 50: 20. ³ Exod. 3: 12. ⁴ Exod. 6: 6-8.

series of events, which follow each other, like the links of a chain, as in the second and eleventh chapters of the prophet Daniel. (4) Various prophecies, which have no particular connection with each other.

§ 111. The Lord says: "Remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, *declaring* the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will *do* all my pleasure; calling a ravenous bird from the east, the man that executeth my counsel from a far country; yea, I have *spoken* it, I will also bring it to pass; I have *purposed* it, I will also do it."¹

Observe, God does not say I have *foreseen* "the end from the beginning," but that he has *declared*, "*spoken*" and "*purposed* it." To say he has "*purposed*" *every thing* would be the same as to say he had *purposed* all the *wickedness* that has been in the world; thus making him the very devil himself. Whatever he *purposes*, he *foreknows*; and because of his omnipotence, there can be no failure in his foreknowledge.

¹ Isa. 46: 9-11.

CHAPTER VII.

QUERIES.

§ 112. 1. Is there any *if* or uncertainty in perfect foreknowledge?

2. Can the word *if* be correctly used without expressing uncertainty? But one common-sense answer can be given to these questions—No. It is *certain* that the Lord frequently uses the word *if* in connection with prophecies relating to future events, with which the actions of men are connected.

3. Did God *purpose* all things at *once*? No one, who is familiar with his Bible would say, Yes, to this question.

4. Without previous purposing, can God see something where there is nothing?

5. Can God hear conversation where there is no sound?

6. Are God's existence, his knowledge, actions and foreknowledge all of the same date?

7. If one event follows another, are both of the same date?

8. Is there any uncertainty as to what an unborn person will do, say or think? If not, then man is bound by fate.

9. Can God have a certain knowledge of that which is uncertain?

10. Did God from eternity hear all the words that would ever be spoken?

11. Did "God from all eternity . . . unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass"?¹

12. Does God know that uncertain things are uncertain?

13. Can any being, created or uncreated, foreknow his future choices?

¹ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, chap. 3, sec. 1.

14. Has God anywhere in the Bible affirmed his prescience of the future volitions of all men?

15. Can that which God has foreseen fail of being accomplished?

16. Can perfect foresight be changed?

17. Is it possible for God to judge any free agent correctly before he has done anything or had any existence?

18. If God sees all actions before they are done, hears all words before they are spoken, and knows all thoughts before they exist in the minds of the thinkers, can there be any such thing as conditional prophecy, promise or covenant?

19. Is conditional foresight possible?

20. Can what God has *foreseen* be changed without making his foresight imperfect?

21. Is there one case of foreknowledge recorded in the Bible, which was the result of *foresight*, without previous *purposing*?

22. Does God know that anything exists which has no existence?

23. If God has *foreseen* all things, can he prevent their accomplishment without destroying the correctness of his foresight? and if he cannot prevent what he has foreseen, is not his omnipotence limited?

24. Can God do anything that he has not eternally *foreseen*? If he can, is not his omniscience limited?

25. Without previous *purposing*, is it possible for God to know non-existent thoughts, to hear unspoken words, and to see actions which have had no existence?

26. Was there any time between the creation of Adam and his sinning?

27. Which did God see first, the creation of Adam or his sinning?

28. Has God eternally foreseen everything as co-existing?

29. Is it possible for God to know the unknowable?

30. Can the will of any person be seen or known before he wills?

31. Which was first, *purposing* or *prophesying*?

32. Is there any prophecy in seeing?

33. If I saw Rome before some other person, and tell him what I saw, is there anything prophetic in my testimony?

34. Is the existence of "unthought-of sensations" conceivable?

35. Is an unthought thought anything?

36. Is it logical to believe that a pure, future contingency can be a present, infallible certainty?

37. Is it possible for a reality to be different from a perfect knowledge of that reality?

Says Dr. L. D. McCabe :

"God cannot know anything contrary to the fact; and a fact, when once a matter of certain knowledge, is unchangeable by any power, human or divine."¹

"Probation to those who are inevitably to be lost, can only be a farce."²

38. Is it possible for anything to be both certain and uncertain at the same time?

39. Did God create all the angels? If so, then he must have created the one who became a devil, and those who became demons. If he *foresaw* what they would do, before he made them; then why did he make "the evil angels"? Will any one claim that it was *best* to have wicked angels and wicked men and women? If it is *best* to have them in *this* world, then why not have them in "the kingdom of heaven"?

Would any *sensible, honest* man, when making a lot of sewing machines for the market, put in some that he knew were utterly worthless, and thus damage his business? If an enemy should derange some of his machines, after they left the hand of the maker, the maker could not be blamed. It is sometimes asked, "Why the Lord did not make the angels and man so that they could not sin?" That was impossible, if they were to be *free agents*. He might have made them mere *machines*, like a music box. But where is the man who would prefer to

¹ *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 303. ² *Ibid.*, p. 354.

be a music box, rather than an intelligent, moral being in the likeness of his Creator?

§ 113. Let it be remembered as a point forever settled, that *it is impossible to foreknow the future choices of free agents, acting under the law of liberty*. When God made the angels and man, there was, perhaps, one chance in a thousand that they might sin; hence God *purposed*, when he made man, that in case he did sin, he would beget a Son at a later period, through whom man might be saved, and secure eternal life. We read of Christ, that he was a "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."¹ He was not *actually* slain there; but only in God's *purpose*, in case the first man should commit sin.

40. Can that which has been seen or foreseen, be otherwise than as it was at the time when seen or foreseen, without destroying the correctness of the sight or foresight?

41. Does sight or foresight *cause* that which is seen or foreseen?

42. If God has foreseen everything, has he caused anything?

43. Has God caused anything which he did not previously purpose?

44. Does God know what he will do before he purposes?

45. Are God's promises based on his purposes or on his foresight?

46. Are the chronological periods of the Bible based on God's purpose or on his foresight?

47. Which was first, purposing or foreknowledge?

48. Does the omniscience of God include a knowledge of nonentities, outside of his purposing?

49. Are the prophecies of the Bible the result of purposing or foreseeing?

50. Has God any foreknowledge of that which has not come to his mind?

51. Are all of God's purposes as eternal as his own existence?

¹ Rev. 13 : 8.

52. From all eternity did God foreknow me, and every act, word, thought and feeling of my life, and my ultimate end?

53. Can a person fail to do what God foreknows he will do?

54. Does God ever change his mind?

55. Can there be a change of mind without a change of knowledge?

56. Is the existence of God and all his foreknowledge co-eternal?

57. Does God always foresee what is best?

58. Does God always purpose what is best?

59. If God *foresees* that an event will take place at a certain future time; can that event take place at any other time, if his foresight is correct?

60. Is there any difference between eternal and universal prescience and eternal and universal foreordination?

CHAPTER VIII.

PROPOSITIONS.

§ 114. 1. "Purpose and prescience in God are inseparable, and the latter must always be the consequence, and not the cause of the former."¹ "The prescience is derived from precisely the same source as the knowledge."² "Prescience or foreknowledge . . . cannot imply that some future thing does now actually exist; but only that some future thing will . . . certainly transpire in consequence of some known cause, which is at present in actual existence."³

2. Prophesying without a previous cause or purpose is inconceivable. In other words, *all foresight or foreknowledge is the result of previous purposing.*

3. Whatever is seen is not prophetic.

4. Whatever is prophetic is non-existent when the prophecy is given.

5. It is impossible for anything to be a contingency and a certainty at the same time.

6. If God knows anything to be a contingency, he does not at the same time know it to be a certainty.

7. The laws of God express his purposes; and all the laws he has made are the result of the action of a previous will.

8. If there be any contingency in the future conversion of any man; then there must be a contingency as to the future conversion of every man. If there is no contingency; then it must follow that the fate of every man is eternally fixed. If there is a contingency, then it cannot be known who will be saved or lost till the close of his probation.

¹ *Eternal Prescience*, by James Jones, p. 138. ² *Ibid.*, p. 26. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

9. "God can no more know all nothings, than he can do all nothings."¹

10. That which has no existence cannot be seen, heard, known or foreknown, only by *purposing*.

11. God's foreknowledge is limited by what has been *purposed*. If he has foreseen *everything*; then he must have purposed everything, which cannot be true.

12. The purpose and prescience of God are always correlated as *cause* and *effect*.

13. "The foreknowledge of a free volition is a contradiction of terms."²

§ 115. 14. Joel S. Hayes offers the following syllogism:

"To work a contradiction in terms is beyond man's power. To cause God's foreknowledge not to have been foreknowledge at the time it was foreknowledge is to work a contradiction in terms; therefore, to cause God's foreknowledge not to have been knowledge at the time it was foreknowledge is beyond man's power.

"To cause God's foreknowledge not to have been knowledge at the time that it was foreknowledge is beyond man's power. If God foreknows that an event will happen; to cause that event to fail to happen is to cause God's foreknowledge not to have been knowledge, but a mere guess, at the time it was foreknowledge; therefore, if God foreknows that an event will happen, to cause that event not to happen is beyond man's power.

"The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible that, if God foreknows an action, it is beyond the power of the agent to cause it to fail to happen; that is, the agent cannot do otherwise than to act it."³

§ 116. 15. Mr. Hayes quotes Albert Taylor Bledsoe as saying:

"The foreknowledge of a future event proves it to be necessary in precisely the same manner that the knowledge of a present event shows it to be necessary."⁴

§ 117. 16. "*The knowledge of a free volition cannot exist before the free volition which is its cause.*"⁵

¹ *Divine Nescience*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 34.

² *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Joel S. Hayes, p. 137. ³ *Ibid.*, pp. 140, 141. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 150. ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

It is absolutely certain that as free volition cannot exist before the one lives who has the volition; therefore it is equally certain that it is impossible for God to know the free volitions of the unborn. It is beyond the limits of omniscience.

§ 118. 17. Mr Hayes truly says:

"The foreknowledge and the thing known are both due to some common necessitating cause. . . . The necessitating cause of the knowledge must be also the necessitating cause of the event." "Things foreknown are necessitated; but free volitions are not necessitated; therefore they are not foreknown."¹

"The necessitating cause of the knowledge" and "of the event" is God's divine *purpose*.

§ 119. 18. There are two classes of future events: those that are *purposed* by God and are *certain*; and those that may be or may not be, and are uncertain.

§ 120. 19. Says Bishop Wm. Taylor:

If the "speculative dogma," that "'God's prescience is eternal and universal'" be "a fact, it will bear inspection; if not, it is time we should know it, and rid ourselves of its damaging disabilities."²

In the foregoing "inspection," it appears very clear, that the doctrine of "eternal and universal prescience" is *utterly unscriptural*; and therefore should have no place in Christian doctrine. The time has come when this should be known by all who love the Bible.

§ 121. 20. Testimony of an intelligent gentleman:

"I hear good preaching but it does me no good; for when I begin to think on the subject, the thought recurs to my mind, 'If God foreknew from all eternity that I would certainly go to hell, what's the use of my trying to change an unalterable certainty.'"³

§ 122. 21. Says Bishop Wm. Taylor:

"It is no discredit to his [God's] prescience to say that he cannot foresee, as a certainty, what is in its very nature an uncertainty, any more than to his omnipotence, to say that God cannot lie, or prove false to himself, or to his immutable arrangements."⁴

¹ *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Joel S. Hayes, p. 160.

² *Election of Grace*, p. 184. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 157. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

22. It remains to be proved that God has ever foretold a single contingent action.

23. The dogma which teaches that "God's prescience is eternal and universal" is not supported by a single text in the Bible; therefore it is unscriptural.

§ 123. 24. Says Dr. L. D. McCabe:

"Unless all of God's thoughts are eternal as himself, . . . there must have been a moment, when the thought of human redemption originated in the divine mind. Now, when was that moment? The only proper and reasonable response that can be given to this inquiry is, that that moment was the instant when the exigency arose in the moral administration of the world. What was true and proper and natural as to the great expedient of redemption is true and proper of lesser expedients in the management of free agents."¹

§ 124. 25. One class of prophecies are *positive* and *unconditioned*; intended to reveal the *purposes* of God towards the human race, in their redemption through Jesus Christ. Another class of prophecies consist of promises and threatenings, *conditioned* upon the future conduct of those to whom they apply.

26. Foreknowledge cannot exceed what was previously purposed, including a knowledge of the effects of known causes.

§ 125. 27. Says Joel S. Hayes:

"To foreknow a free volition is a contradiction."²

28. If God has eternally foreseen all the actions, words and thoughts of all men; then one of two things is absolutely certain: (1) No one can possibly fail to do, say and think what God has eternally foreseen; or (2) God's foresight is uncertain and unreliable.

29. All of God's purposes are supported by his omnipotence, and consequently are infallible.

30. Without *purposing*, it is inconceivable, incredible, unthinkable, unscriptural, absurd and impossible, for God to foreknow the future choices of free agents, acting under the law of liberty.

¹ *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Dr. L. D. McCabe, p. 177.

² *The Foreknowledge of God*, by Joel S. Hayes, p. 46.

31. The foreknowledge of contingent events is impossible. The foreknowledge of an event proves that it is not contingent.

32. Human knowledge and foreknowledge are based on the *same principles* as is the divine knowledge and foreknowledge; the one being *finite*, the other *infinite*. There is no such thing as uncertain knowledge. It is a contradiction of terms.

33. The foreknowledge of God is caused by his *purposing*, supported by his omnipotence. The foreknowledge of man is caused by his purposing, supported by his impotence.

34. Prescience is never the cause of foreknowledge.

§ 126. 35. Says James Jones:

"Eternal prescience and eternal fatalism must always stand or fall together."¹

36. All unspoken words are non-existences; therefore they have never been heard, and consequently are unknown.

37. All actions, words and thoughts which have not been *purposed* are utterly non-existent; and therefore unknown and unknowable.

38. Whatever has been seen or foreseen is forever *fixed*.

39. Whatever has been *purposed* can be changed, till what was purposed is accomplished, when it becomes a fixed fact.

40. The law of foreknowledge may be summed up in a few words, as follows: Action precedes events; and *purposing* precedes actions; therefore, *purposing* is the cause of all things except accidents and the First Cause. It is impossible to have a knowledge of a purpose before its existence; consequently, the foreknowledge of a purpose, before its existence, is an impossibility. The foreknowledge of an event begins with the *purpose* which *caused* the event. Inasmuch as sight and foresight do not *cause* anything; it necessarily follows that sight and foresight never produce foreknowledge; consequently, they have nothing to do with prophecy.

Bro. Bowman has well said: "The Bible is a book of inspired common-sense; and as such, it is not opposed to our common-sense."

¹ *Eternal Prescience*, p. 125.

INDEX.

The *figures* refer to the *sections*.

A	Andrews, Dr., an important statement.....	10
B	Bledsoe, A. T., statement.....	116
	Bowman, H. W., statement.....	126
	Bowne, Dr. B. P.....	12, 13, 15, 56, 61
C	Calvin, John, partial redemption.....	92
	Campbell, Dr., honest confession.....	31
	Certainties.....	45
	Clark, Samuel, eternal now.....	57
	Conditional prophecy.....	85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 93-105
	Contingencies.....	70
	Cook, Joseph, eternal now.....	71
	Cousin, Victor, eternal now.....	58
D	Dick, Dr. John, foreordination.....	22, 24
	Dorner, Dr., eternal now.....	66
E	Edwards, Jonathan, contingencies unknown.....	20, 34
	Eternal foresight.....	46, 47, 48, 50, 51
	Eternal now.....	55-72
F	Fisk, Dr. Wilbur, cause of foreknowledge.....	18
	Foreknowledge, its cause.....	83
	Foreordination.....	39, 41-44
	Four classes of prophecy.....	110, 111
G	God does not know that uncertainties are certainties.....	82-90
	God's infallible <i>purpose</i>	54
	God's knowledge of men a personal acquirement.....	52
	God's limitation.....	81
	God's memory.....	72
	God's new thoughts.....	63, 64, 68, 69

H

Hamilton, Sir Wm., eternal now.....	58
Haven, Bishop E O.....	4
Hayes, Joel S	27, 115, 118, 125
Hodge, Dr. Charles.....	21, 35, 49
Hurst, Prof. J. F.....	17

J

Jamieson, Dr. John, future choices unknown.....	8, 19
Jones, James, the basis of foreknowledge.....	53, 126

L

Law of foreknowledge.....	126
---------------------------	-----

M

McCabe, Dr L. D.....	16, 33, 37, 59, 67, 91, 123
McCosh, Dr., special difficulty.....	7

P

Porter, Dr. Noah, eternal now.....	60
Positive prophecy and Bible examples.....	107-109
Propositions.....	114-126

Q

Queries.....	112, 113
--------------	----------

R

Rothe, Prof. R.....	6
---------------------	---

S

Stuart, Dugald.....	32
---------------------	----

T

Taylor, Bishop, Wm.....	28, 120, 122
The golden mean.....	73
Tillotson, Archbishop.....	5

W

Watson, Bishop Richard.....	3
Wesley, John.....	29
Wiley, Bishop I.....	2, 26

This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the date
stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is
by retaining it beyond the specified
time.

Please return promptly.

